

OCT 23 1963

FOIAb3b

**THESE DAYS:**

# Contrasting Case Of Two Cubans

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

CPYRGHT

**T**HERE is something fishy about our treatment of anti-Castro Cubans who have escaped to this country. Some of them have utmost freedom of movement, and they travel between Florida and the countries of Central America with no effort to put fetters on them. But others, who have absolute proof of their loyalty to the anti-Castro cause, are shadowed and hectored, and if they should ever leave the U.S. and return again they would be penalized with \$5,000 fines or five years in jail, or both.

Take the contrasting cases of Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz and Manuel Artime, for example. Diaz Lanz, who was the first important figure in the anti-Batista revolutionary movement to suspect that Castro was a Communist, is virtually under house arrest in this country.



CHAMBERLAIN

Artime, on the other hand, is the fair-haired boy of our State Department, the leader whom we have blessed as the probable boss of the next invasion of Cuba, if and when it happens. As the chosen general of next Summer's projected "expeditionary force," Artime can turn up in Nicaragua, or Guatemala, or anywhere he pleases, subject to no \$5,000 fine.

There are Cubans who mutter that Artime's military ability is questionable; they tell you that he joined forces with a rebel band on the fringes of Castro's stronghold in Cuba's Sierra Maestra at the tag end of the Batista regime, and that he was made a second lieutenant without fighting experience. They will also tell you that Artime's defection from the Castro cadres came late. Still, Artime had sufficient courage to serve as civil leader of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and one cannot argue against courage.

The relevant questions to all center not on Artime's date of defection from Castro but on his ability to build the best fighting force possible, and his willingness to establish and protect a post-Castro regime that will be something better than a Titoist version of what exists in Cuba today.

The worrisome thing about the situation is that there seems to be no room in the State Department-CIA-Artime coalition for daring Cubans who have offended the Casper Milquetos, who frown on "premature" raids on Castro's sanctuaries.

Diaz Lanz was a bold just when he commanded the rebel air units in the campaign against Batista, and he was equally bold when he became the first defector.

A COMMERCIAL PILOT, Diaz Lanz used his skills under the Batista regime to ferry arms by air into the "Castro country" of the Sierra Maestra, landing on pocket-size airstrips at great risk to his own life. He believed thoroughly in the "revolution" until he had his ears opened to its secret Communist orientation by the conversations he overheard while transporting Castro and his friends around the country.

Appalled by what he had learned, he tried to warn anti-Communist members of Castro's cabinet. When they refused to listen, he fled Cuba.

Diaz Lanz ought to be a hero to a Washington Administration that is officially anti-Castro. But this "first defector" has sinned by continuing to be bold. He complains that the U.S. is trying to collect a \$2,000 fine from him for having flown over Havana in 1959 and "bombed" it with anti-Castro leaflets. The technical charge is that his pilot's license had lapsed.

Why are people like Diaz Lanz hindered in their efforts to carry on a struggle against Castro while others, such as Artime, are favored?

There are Cubans who say it's all a question of political coloration. The State Department has a predilection for the Bosch-Betancourt type of Latin American politico who is loosely to be described as belonging to the "non-Communist Left."

Now, a Betancourt is preferable in Venezuela to a Castro or a Khrushchev or a Mao Tse-tung Communist, and it is the mark of prudence to deal with a Betancourt when he has achieved power by his own efforts. But why connive to put the "non-Communist Left" in power when it is a matter of starting from scratch? Why go out of our way to create Betancourts?

One does not expect democratic capitalism to be restored in Cuba overnight. But our State Department could at least favor democratic capitalism as a working direction, and not make it difficult for its proponents to play their part in the anti-Castro ranks.

Copyright, 1963, King Features Syndicate, Inc.